



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,680	01/21/2004	Osamu Kobayashi	GENSP047	5247
58766	7590	03/04/2009	EXAMINER	
Beyer Law Group LLP			SHAIFFER HARRIMAN, DANT B	
P.O. BOX 1687				
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2434	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/762,680	Applicant(s) KOBAYASHI, OSAMU
	Examiner DANT B. SHAIFER HARRIMAN	Art Unit 2434

All Participants:**Status of Application:** Pending(1) DANT B. SHAIFER HARRIMAN.(3) Michael Ferrazano.

(2) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 February 2009**Time:** 1pm eastern standard time, 10am pacific western time**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

Claims 1 - 16, 18 20, 21

Prior art documents discussed:

*None***Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Kambiz Zand/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The following was discussed, the examiner called the above applicants representative, to point to applicant that applicant submitted no claims when the RCE and IDS was filed on 12/01/2008, therefore examiner assumed that the claim filed 11/12/2008 was to be used to when reviewing the IDS, then examiner questioned, didn't applicant submit a complete listing of claims, therefore this prompted examiner to contact applicants representative.